

No 15<sup>th</sup> of 1889-90

From,

The Nawab of Savanur.

To,

The Collector and Political Agent  
Bharwar.

Savanur Nawabsahib's office

23<sup>rd</sup> of November 1889.

Sir,

Referring to your endorsement No

2232 dated the 22<sup>nd</sup> April 1889, I have

the honor to inform you that, although

it is now more than 5 months since

Ramazan has elapsed, Abdul Ganiyar

W Khan of Hyderabad has not <sup>up to this time</sup> appeared

before me as he had promised to do

soon after Ramazan and <sup>therefore,</sup> to request the

favor of your ~~info~~ directing him

through the Hyderabad authorities, to  
appear in ~~my~~ <sup>the</sup> court <sup>of my Diwan</sup> in person or by  
a duly authorized agent. on the 25<sup>th</sup> of  
January 1890 and requiring him to  
take notice that in default of his  
appearance on the day beforementioned.

the application made by Abdul Nadiem-  
Chau. as regards the cash allowance  
will be determined in his absence.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most sincere friend,

Nawab of Savanur.

Political office.

No 2083 of 1890

From

J. A. Crawford Esquire,  
First assistant Resident  
Hyderabad.

To

The Collector and Political agent  
Sharwar.

Dated Hyderabad Residency 12<sup>th</sup> May 1890.

Sir,

With reference to Correspondence ending  
with your Endorsement No 5852 dated the 11<sup>th</sup>  
December 1889, regarding the attendance  
of one Abdul Ganizarkhan before the Dewans  
Court at Sawanir, I am directed to forward  
for your information a copy of a Euka —  
addressed to his Highness the Nizams' minister  
on the subject.

I have the honor to be

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant

(sd) C. H. Pritchard.

for First asstt B

No 2152 of 1890

Dharwar 26<sup>th</sup> May 1890

Copy with Copy of the accompaniment

forwarded to the Navab of Sawanur

with reference to his No 45 of 23<sup>rd</sup>

December 1889.

Allesing

Collector & Political Agent.

Dharwar.

Recd  
28/5/90



Copy of Ruka No 1630 dated the 15<sup>th</sup>  
May 1890 from the Resident to the  
Minister.

In acknowledging the receipt of your  
ruka No 1063 dated the 29<sup>th</sup> ultimo, regarding  
the attendance of one Abdul Janizarkhan  
before the Dewans Court at Sawanur,  
I have the honor to request that you will  
be so good as to inform the said individual  
that he should address his request for further  
time to the Sawanur Dewans Court, Abdul  
Janizarkhan should also be informed  
that in the event of his failing to appear  
the claim in which he is concerned will  
doubtless be decided in his absence.

- True Copy.

(Signed) H. Walker.

off. C. Head Clerk Residents

True copy

Robinson

Collector & Secy

No 11 of 1886/89

From,

The Nawab Sahib,

Savannur,

To,

The Acting Collector and Political  
Agent Bharuvar,

Savannur Nawab Sahib's Office,

27th of January 1889,

Sir,

I have the honor to give you  
a short account of the 5 gadees from  
Abdul Rahim Khan son of Abdul Dilawarkhan  
Khanjāde Savannur, to your address, which  
you have been pleased to forward to me  
for disposal and of his character, after  
getting information from my Dewan.

The petitioner says in his petition  
dated 17-12-88, that his wife Hussain Khatun

has applied against him to the District  
Magistrate Savanur for an order of maintenance  
under Section 488 of the Cr. P. Code. That  
this case has been got up at my secret  
instigation and malice with the view  
of persecuting the petitioner, that the District  
Magistrate is likely to be disposed and  
biased in favor of the woman, she being  
under my protection and that under these  
circumstances the case be transferred to  
Your (Political Agent's) Court.

In his Vernacular letter dated 22-12-88,  
he writes that the woman claiming to  
be his wife was divorced by him, on account  
of her misconduct no sooner than she  
had been married to him.

In his petition dated 16-1-89, he clearly  
says that although he is willing to  
maintain his wife, in case of her  
living with him, the District Magistrate

has decided his wife's claim expa  
and ordered to attach his house and  
cash allowance and that the allowance  
has consequently been stopped.

In his deposition on oath before the  
District Magistrate, the petitioner plainly  
admits that his cash allowance has been  
neither stopped nor attached, that he has  
not drawn his allowance, thinking within  
himself that it might perhaps have  
been stopped by my orders and that he  
is now ready to maintain his wife  
provided she lives with him, the  
divorce alleged to have been given to  
her being untrue and merely for the sake  
of frightening her.

My Dewan writes about the petitioner  
as follows.

The petitioner's cash allowance has.

been neither stopped nor attached. It had remained unpaid for 2 months as he himself had not come and demanded it and it was given on 19th January 1889, on his producing a due receipt. The petitioner might perhaps have lost his Reeves and consequently might be submitting letters containing circumstances which are quite untrue and converse to me another or he might be making them with intent to make the names of the local authorities bad.

The petitioner says in one of his petitions that he has sworn by the Koran that he would never go to my office as there exists bitter enmity between him and me but on 19th January 1889, he appeared before my Diwan, drew his cash allowance and deposed that ~~that~~ he would maintain his wife if she lives with him.

As his wife refused to live with him without any sufficient reason the District Magistrate passed an order that she was not ~~entitled~~ entitled to receive any allowance from her husband.

I have the report of my Division and from the petitioner being addicted to making such false petitions over & over again for nothing, I conclude that he does so with a view that no action should be taken by the local authorities in case of there being any application made, by some party against him, for his misconduct.

I have submitted these few lines with the view that you may be acquainted with the bad character of the petitioner.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

your sincere friend,

Alvius T. L. King  
Nawab Sahib Sarwar,

No. 16 of 1888/89

France,

The Nawab Sahib,

Savannah,

To,

The Acting Collector and Political Agent;

Shawar,

Lawrence Saw at Patel's Office,

16<sup>th</sup> of March 1869.

Phil,

I have the honor to give you  
a short information about the petition of  
Rahim Khan Khanyade, under your endorse-  
ment No 80 dated 12th March 1869 and to  
submit the whole of the records of the miscel-  
laneous applications No 1 of 1869.

Abdul Dawlat-Khan and Abdul Dilawar-Khan were full brothers. The sons of Abdul Dawlat-Khan namely Abdul Majid Khan, Abdul Khudros Khan and Abdul Mubaras Khan filed a Suit - on 14th September 1877 in the



Court of the 1st class subject Savanur against  
the sons of Abdul Dilawarkhan viz Abdul  
Tabrezkhan, Abdul Shamshodin Khan & Rahim  
Khan (the petitioners) to recover their share  
of the ancestral landed property and also  
for the meane profits. The subjectge passed a  
decree on 26th April 1883 to the effect that the  
plaintiffs ought to recover some of the  
property alleged in the plaint, which the  
subjectge found to be ancestral in case of  
their paying Repees 1900 to the defendants and  
that they were not entitled to recover meane  
profits as they had failed to prove the  
amount.

The plaintiffs applied to the Political Agent  
on 30th May 1883 for leave to appeal as  
paupers against the said decree. The inquiry  
into the pauperism of the applicants was made  
by the Court against whose decision the appeal  
was made ~~by the Court against whose decision~~

~~the appeal was made~~, under the orders  
of the appellate court. After enquiry, the  
lower court ~~the~~ found that the applicants  
were not paupers and reported to the appellate  
court to that effect. The case was left un-  
decided by the Political Agent. On my  
assuming the management of the State it  
was handed over to me for disposal according  
to law. As the enquiry in connection the  
case had been already completed, I fixed the  
13th day of this month for hearing the  
application and pronouncing my order and  
issued notices to all the parties concerned  
directing them to appear before me on the day  
so fixed. The notices were duly served on  
all the parties. The applicants and Abdul  
Labren Khan appeared in my court on the  
fixed date and the petitioner & Abdul Chaush-  
din Khan were absent. On that day, on hearing

the parties <sup>present</sup> ~~concerned~~, I ordered for reasons given in my order that the applicants would not be allowed to appeal as paupers as they were able to pay the fee required for the petition of appeal.

It now this, you will observe that the present case has been decided in favor of the petitioner and that he has no reason to apply to you. If the case had been decided against him he was at liberty to apply to you for review of the case under.

The rules laid down in G. R. No 155 dated 7th January 1889. As stated above the petitioner has no reason to apply to you to exercise your power of advising me in this case, as it has been already decided in his favor. I am therefore of opinion that

This petition should be summarily rejected.

I have however submitted the whole of

The record of the case for your perusal  
as asked for in your endorsement.

As the appellants Abdul Majid Khan &  
Abdul Khodush Khan &c have now paid  
the fee required for the petition of appeal.

I have caused the appeal to be numbered  
and entered in a book, <sup>Kept</sup> for the purpose and  
have proceeded with it according to law.

I therefore hope that you will kindly  
return the whole of the record of the case at  
your early convenience.

The petitioner's application is returned  
herewith.

I have the honor to be,

Res,

Your sincere friend,

— Ali Akbar Khan  
Kandahar, Kandahar,

No 20 of 1888/89.

From,

The Nawaab Sahab,

Savanur,

To,

The Acting Collector and Political Agent,

Bharwar,

Savanur Nawaab Sahab's Office,

Hotanahalli, 27th of March 1889,

Sir,

I have the honor to state that the papers, connected with the miscellaneous application No. 1 of 1889 sent to your office with this Office. No 16 ~~of~~ dated the 16<sup>th</sup> instant, have not yet been received, as advised by you, in your memo No 1646 dated the 23rd instant, to have been returned to me and to request the favor of your returning them at your early convenience. Only a Canarese petition of Abdul Rahim Khan Khairi has accompanied the memo.

I have the honor to be,  
Sir,

Your sincere friend,

Mulraj Talpuri Jee  
Naubat Sahib of Savanur,

No 13 of 1891-92,

From,

The Nawab of Savanur.

To,

The Collector and Political  
Agent Dharwar.


Savanur 15<sup>th</sup> of November 1891.

Sir

I have the honor to submit  
you a few lines on the subject referred  
to in the petition of Abdul Rahim Khan  
Khanjade returned herewith, in  
compliance with your endorsement No.  
5611 of 18<sup>th</sup> September 1891.

Lalkhatu Lubee was the wife  
of Abdul Hamid Khan Sahib 3rd  
son of my great-grand father Nawab  
Abdul Khair Khan Sahib Diler Jung  
Bahadur. Abdul Hamid Khan,  
predeceased his father without issue.

Lalkhatu had from the state a monthly life allowance of rupees 20-8-0 and an Inamland for her maintenance and a house for her residence. She died in July 1891. On her death the allowance was stopped and the house was taken possession of by the state. Her burial and funeral ceremonies were performed at the expense of the state.

 Abdul Rahim Khan the petitioner is the 3<sup>rd</sup> son of Lalkhatu's brother Abdul Dilawar Khan. I have herewith sent copy of the agreement executed by Dilawar Khan and his brother Dowlat Khan in the name of my grand father. In favor of perusal of the para underlined in red, you will be convinced, I am sure that none but the state have any



title to the property held by Lalkhatu  
deceased.

The petitioner is not at all  
entitled to the cash allowance, the  
house &c. held by her.

I have the honor to be  
Sir  
your most sincere friend

Rajah of Saramer.

To

The Honourable Governor of  
Bombay.

Honoured Sir

I, Abdul Rahimkhan son of  
Dilawarkhan brother of kawale Savamier  
state. Most-humbly beg to bring your  
kind notice that my aunt who received  
a salary of Rupees Twenty and annas  
eight-permouth died without any  
male issue. It is now three months  
since her death. I with my five brothers  
are best suited heirs to receive her  
salary and houses. But the kawale  
has ceased giving us the salary and  
has kept her house in his possession.  
Therefore, I beg most respectfully to  
confer upon me the favor of giving  
salary and her houses to me and  
my other five brothers for which

I shall ever be grateful.

I beg to remain Honoured  
Sir

Your honors most O. serv<sup>t</sup>

(Signed) in Persian

Through.

The Political Agent

Dharwar.

No 5611 of 1891.

18<sup>th</sup> September 1891.

Forwarded to the Hawab  
of Savanur for favour of report.

(Sd) E. Gray.

5473 Savanur.  
14-9-91.

Political Agent  
Dharwar.

No 14 of 1891-92

Savanur 15<sup>th</sup> November 1891.

Returned with compliments to the  
Collector and Political Agent Dharwar  
with this office No 13 of 1891-92 dated this day.

Hawab Sahab Savanur

No 17 of 1888/89,

From,

The Nawabsahab,

Savanur,

To,

The Acting Collector and Political,

Agent Bharewar,

Savanur Nawabsahab's Office,

25<sup>th</sup> of March 1889,

Sir,

With reference to the petition of Abdul  
Rahim Khan son of Janiyakhan Khanyade of  
Basawankop, under your endorsement No. 1387  
dated the 13<sup>th</sup> of March 1889, I have the honor  
to submit you a few lines after searching  
the old records.

on 16<sup>th</sup> March 1882

The petitioner lodged a petition to the  
The Commissioner S.D., about the subject alluded  
to in his petition, having appended a copy  
of ~~the petition~~ will executed by him in favor  
of one Nasarodin. After having got information

from the Collector and Political Agent, the  
Commissioner issued an order dated 30th March  
1883 No.  $\frac{P}{31}$  of 1883 to the effect that no promise  
could be given that his will would be  
confirmed, that there was no reason whatsoever  
for the state, to object to his making a will  
and that the title of heirship of the person  
claiming under the will or in any other way,

should be established in <sup>A second time</sup> the civil Court. The

~~petition~~ applied applied to the late Nawab Sahib  
~~a second time~~

on the same subject. While the matter was

still under consideration, the Nawab Sahib died.

~~At this~~ ~~his~~ death, the case was referred to the Collector  
and Political Agent who issued an order dated

11th March 1886 No 305 that nothing would be  
done in regards to the petition as it had

already been decided by him and the Commissioner

S.D..

A third time,

+ He made a third petition to my Dewan

on 2nd. December 1886, who without taking any

steps about the petition, referred ~~the~~ ~~petitioner~~ him

to the previous orders mentioned above.

In this way the petitions on the subject have been considered & decided, ~~more than~~ ~~once~~. I do not see any reason to ~~not~~ interfere <sup>now</sup> with the previous orders and to take steps about the petition, during the life time of the petitioner. On his death the case will be considered and decided according to law.

The petition is returned herewith as desired.

I have the honor to be,

Res,

Yours sincere friend,

Abdullah Khan  
Khanab Sahib, Lavanur

To,

• The Political Agent.

Sharee ar,

Most respected Sir,

I the undersigned most humbly  
 & respectfully beg to lay before your honor  
 the following few lines & hope that they will  
 meet with your honor's kind consideration  
 & Recd

I have an Inam land of mine of  
Lurvey No, 13 Acres <sup>Guithas</sup><sub>20</sub> paying Rs <sup>68</sup><sub>27</sub> ~~annually~~ <sup>per</sup>  
annually & a house of mine in Basvareop a  
village in Savanur state. This being my Inam  
land is to be continued to me in  
perpetuity upon which His Highness The Nawab  
of Savanur has no claim whatsoever. I gave  
the abovesmentioned land & the house as a  
reward to Mr. Nasarodien Esq. Hajarat Sahib  
a near relative of mine on the 8th of October 1858

and to that effect I have passed a deed  
which has been registered. I applied on the  
10th January 1889 to Ras Bahadur <sup>Diwan</sup> of  
Savanur that the property should be entered  
in Mr. Nasarodien's name, to which I received  
a reply No. 410 on the 22nd January 1889 that  
nothing would be done in regards to the petition.  
He has no authority & has no legal grounds  
to give me such a flat reply. I request your  
honor therefore that your honor will be kind  
enough to order the Diwan to enter the property  
in Nasarodien's name as I wish. In case  
your honor has any objection to give such  
an order I wish to file a suit in a civil  
Court against His Highness the Nawab of  
Savanur. Your honor will let me know in  
virtue of Section 13 of 1830 in what Court I should  
file the suit.

For this act of kindness I shall ever  
pray for your Honor's long life & prosperity.

Lakshmeswar  
Dated 7th March  
1889

I beg to remain,  
Sir,



your honor's most humble  
& faithful servant.

(Signed)

Abdul Raheem Khan <sup>us</sup> Jhaniatha  
Khanjade Birendar Nawab Savanur  
now at - Luckhmeshwar & Miraj

1711 - 11-3-89.

Savanur,

No. 1384.

Dadas 13 March 1889.

Forwarded to the Nawab of Savanur for  
report with the undersigned's compliments.

16 E. Wheeler

To be returned as Collr & P. S.

Recd

15/3/89

True copy

No. 18 of 1888/89

Savanur Nawab Sahab's office.

25<sup>th</sup> of March 1889,

Returned to the Collector and Political Agent  
Sharwar with this office letter No 17 of 1888/89, with  
the compliments of the undersigned.

Abdul Wahid, Kk  
Nawab Sahab Saudan

To

His Excellency

The Right Honourable

The Governor & President  
in Council

Political Department

Bombay.

The humble petition of Abdul Fateg

Khan Son of Abdul Feroz Khan

Brother Nawab of Savanur in

Dist. of Dharwar

Most Respectfully sheweth

That your humble petitioner prays to draw  
your Excellency's kind attention to the follow-  
ing few lines.

The Savanur State had  
possessed 22 Mahals, when Nawab Abdul  
Hakim Khan your Excellency's pre-  
great-grand father was re-

were seized in his Nawab Hakim Khan  
time by Tipu Sultan. Afterwards the  
Peshwa Government granted a pension of  
48000 Rs to the said Nawab in his interview with  
him. After the said Nawab's death, the Peshwa  
granted 25 villages in place of 48000 Rs.  
These twenty five were then divided into  
three parts; 8 for the State & 4 to our brothers  
at Basantpuri and 13 to Abdul Chenu  
Khan (your Excellency's petitioners grand  
father) for protecting and maintaining  
all the children and women of Nawab  
Hakim Khan's family. This practice  
was continued for a long time when at the  
time of accession of Nawab Suleiman  
son of Nawab Hakim Khan, the said Nawab  
Khan prevailed upon your excellency's  
petitioners father Abdul Suleiman  
to his side and united

these 13 villages to the State and got an  
agreement made in 1255 Hijra to the effect  
that the revenues 12,000 hands, accruing  
from these 13 villages should be constantly  
given to your Excellency's petitioner's father  
and his descendants. Afterwards the  
terms of the agreement were brought into  
practice for 30 or 35 years. Your Excell-  
ency's petitioner begs to state here, that  
this agreement was brought into execut-  
ion by Mr Middleton, when one of his  
terms viz that the allowance will be  
made per every Moglai month (not  
per an English month) was broken. While  
Mr Ogilvie was the Political Agent,  
your Excellency's petitioner's father  
said to him that the Nawab for  
the time being did not pay him

the allowance agreed for those last 7 years  
Mr. Ogilvie then reported the matter to  
the government, and order to reconcile and  
decide the causes of disputes between  
Abdul Salavar Khan and Nawab  
Abdul Sale Khan, sent Mr. Gordon  
1<sup>st</sup> asst collector Sharnas to Savanur  
before Mr. Gordon your Excellency's  
applicant's father in 1859 relinquished  
the claim of 1400 hums for receiving  
Rs 1300 in addition to fields in chillur  
Gabbur, Savanur, Belivati Taluka  
Mangal, and four servants whose <sup>pay</sup> he  
should however be received from the  
State & got an agreement to the above  
effect signed by Mr. Gordon. The  
Nawab promised in this agreement  
of 1859 that in case if he failed to act  
according to the agreement, the British  
Government would enforce the execution.

Afterwards Burkhardar late Navab  
Abdul Fatah Khan forcibly seized  
your excellency's petitioner's garden  
of Belwatti two years ago. your excellency's  
petitioner reported the matter to the Political  
Agent and asked him to enforce the  
execution of the agreement but the  
political Agent was for applicants  
misfortune deaf to his entreaties and  
gave an order that he could not interfere  
with the Navab's proceedings. under  
these circumstances your excellency's  
petitioner begs to say that the British  
Government would see how many  
hardships did his family suffer and  
that the government would favourably  
consider the agreement passed between  
the applicants' father and the Navab.  
He prays the government to enforce  
its execution by restoring the applicants'  
garden in which agreement the Na

himself agrees that he should he,  
fail to execute it, the British Govern-  
ment would enforce its execution,  
and now as the Nawab failed to do so  
in the same way as Mr. Middleton  
enforced the agreement of 1255 Hijary  
under the order of the Government (please  
see the copy of the agreement and that  
of Paravanna) which are attached  
for your excellency's kind perusal  
and favourable consideration.

Dharwar

11 Novmbr 1893

Signed

Abdul Kader Khan

in Persian



Application H. E. The Governor  
in Council Bombay  
under dated 11 November 1873  
to be returned from Abdul Fatah

Subject

in the enforcement of an } No 6931 Camp Huk  
agreement by the Nawab } 1st December 1873  
of Savanur

Forwarded to the Assistant Political  
Agent Savanur for report with reference  
to the accompanying documents.

Signed A. Wingate

Collector and Political Agent

No 1674 Padkod - 2nd December 1873

Forwarded in original to the Dewan  
of Savanur for report together with  
correspondence dealing with the matter



marked in pencil ~~to be returned~~

Ed. A. R. Jones  
Asst Political agent

To be returned

Reed  
5/12/93.

No 27 of 1893-94

Savarni Devan's Office

The January 1894

Returned with compliments to the 1st  
Asst Collector and Political Agent  
Dharwar.

I have the honor to report with reference  
to the petition and its accompanying  
documents as follows —

In Hangal Taluka at Belwatti  
this state has been enjoying from a  
long time a piece of garden land as  
Inam, which is one of the Patalkigudi  
Inam. It was given to Lady Lal-  
Rihatubawa wife of Abdul Naimur-  
Khan, elder brother of <sup>The</sup> late Nawab  
Abdul Daler Khan the grand father  
of the late Nawab Abdul Farez Khan  
Daler Jang Bahadur, together with a  
monthly cash allowance of Rs 2

annas 8 and a house (the part of the Mahal) for her residence.

Lady Lalkhatu<sup>babu.</sup> enjoyed the allowance and the yearly profits of the same garden land untill her death which occurred on 12<sup>th</sup> July 1890. As she was a childless widow the cash payment of the allowance being a life allowance was stopped and the house she lived in and the garden she enjoyed were resumed by the state. Since that time the yearly profits of the garden have been enjoyed by the Savanur state by the tenant of the garden one Lingappa Hyagiri.

Such being the state of the things, the applicant Abdul Pubrez Khan, petitioned to the Munsiff of Hangal, pretending that he had leased the garden to one Fakirappa Byalal, to assist him to enforce the lease money of 1891-92 from the said Fakirappa. In that case the Munsiff

name was entered among the names of defendants. The Mamlatdar after full consideration decided unfavourably to the petitioners. He appealed to the Second <sup>st</sup> ~~st~~ Collector Dharwar who confirmed the decree of the lower court. After this the appellant and her younger brother Abdul Ghama Shodukhan made a petition to the Collector and Political Agent Dharwar complaining that the Nawaab took possession of the garden unlawfully and that it should be given to them. The Political Agent after receiving proper information from this office through you, expressed in his vernacular No <sup>23</sup> <sub>11-4-93</sub> That what the late Nawaab did, was right and that he could not do any change in it. The same order has been, by the petition, appended to the petition.

In this manner the matter about the possession of the garden has been decided and the correspondance of

same which had been forwarded here  
through you for the information of the  
Record with your vernacular No. 527  
21-4-93

has been returned to your office with  
vernacular No. 80  
21-4-93 for being recorded

The petitioner shows his claim to the  
garden land by the agreement made  
between  
by the late Navab Abdul Delarkhan  
and the petitioner's father Abdul Delavarkhan  
in the presence of Mr Gordon the then  
1st asst Collector of Sharnar on the  
2nd of July 1859 and by the Parawane  
and given to him by the same Navab  
on the 27th of February 1847. Copies of  
documents have been attached to  
the petition by the petitioner. The  
copies have been countersigned by  
the Political Agent as having been  
compared with the original documents.  
The documents are genuine in the  
3rd section Para 5th of the agreement  
made by the Navab with Delavarkhan

it is stated; The garden land at Belwatti  
is granted to, and is in the possession  
of Lady Lalkhatu, for which we have  
given Parawana in the name of  
your son Abdul Tabrez Khan in 1263  
Hizary to be continued to him as  
stated in it. In the Parawana made  
in 1263 Hizary 27<sup>th</sup> February 1847 it is  
also clearly stated "The garden land, which  
is in the possession of Lady Lalkhatu  
wife of my deceased brother Abdul Saunwar  
will revert to the state after death." But  
by the entreaties of Delavarkhan to grant  
it to his son, it was added to it "after the  
death of Lady Lalkhatu, Burkhudar  
Abdul Tabrez Khan and his heirs should  
enjoy the possession of it from this it is  
doubtful to ascertain whether it was granted  
to the petitioners lawfully or it was given as  
hereditary allowances or it was a mere  
grant, Had it been a part of the

it would have been given in the name  
of the father not in that of the son, to  
be divided equally among the petitioner's  
brothers as it is not the case it is clear  
that it is a ~~mere~~ mere grant. If it  
be a mere grant it is not a lawfull  
one; because though the land lies in  
the British territory, it is considered  
as a state property, and if it be a  
state property it is evident by many  
Bombay  
Government Resolutions that Dow had  
~~not~~ any right whatever to ~~aff~~ alienate  
the state property, besides this the granted  
land was not in the possession of the  
Dow at the time it was granted. It  
was held by Lady Lakshatubai  
until her death, and so the petitioner  
(the receiver of the grant) was never  
in the possession of it. Such gift  
by the Mahomedan law is supposed  
null and void.

referring to Indian law reports



From these circumstances it  
seems reasonable that both the Marine  
and the Political agent are right  
in their decision they have considered

I have the honor to be  
 Sir  
 Your most obedient servant  
 D. W. of Savannah.